

## **.41 Land**

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)
Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity
Lands
Objective Number
L-1

Objective: L-1

Provide maximum acreage of public land for multiple use and sustained yield management.

Rationale:

Multiple use and sustained yield is declared as policy for management of public lands in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA Sec. 102[a][7] and Sec. 302[b]). Many thousands of acres of public land have been removed from this productive capability by operation of withdrawals and classifications. Some of the withdrawals are suspected of no longer serving the intent of the original withdrawal use, and the management that is being done by the withdrawing agency can be accomplished by BLM. Classification has removed lands from disposal and agricultural entries that may be identified in this planning study.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

LANDS DECISION

The public lands within the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area will be retained in public ownership unless it has been determined through this land use planning process that disposal of a particular parcel is in the national interest.

The segregation against mineral entry on the Mahogany Creek Natural Area, the George Lund Petrified Forest, and the Lovelock Cave will be retained.

Rationale

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act gives BLM the charter to retain public lands for multiple use management. Since the Bureau is in the process of revising the classification of lands which was made pursuant to the C and MU Act of September 19, 1964, it is imperative that the public lands be designated for retention and multiple use management.

Further, 43 CFR 2200.1 states as follows, public lands may be disposed of by exchange under this part only if their disposal is in conformance with the land use planning provisions contained in subpart 1601 of this title.

Further, 43 CFR 2711.1-1 "Identification of tracts by land use planning" states as follows: "Tracts of public lands shall only be offered for sale in the implementation of land use plans prepared and approved in accordance with subpart 1601 of this title.

The checkerboard lands have been recommended for retention because they are very high in mineral values and their disposition would cause extreme difficulty in administration.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Lands L-1.1
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: L 1.1

MFP 1 Review all withdrawn lands for restoration to the full operation of the land laws. These are noted as W-1 through W-8 on the L1-S-1 Overlay, and W-9 through W-15 on the L1-BW-1 Overlay.

Rationale:

Most of the withdrawn lands are by the Water and Power Administration (WPA formerly known as Bureau of Reclamation). These lands have been turned over to the State of Nevada to manage through a no-fee cooperative agreement. The State, in turn, has leased these lands to private ranches who use the leases for "exchange of use" lands to justify leasing of additional public lands from BLM. BLM management of these 105,758 acres would restore them to the flexibility required for multiple use and sustained yield.

This review is mandated no later than 10/21/91 by FLPMA Sec. 204(K)(1)(1) for all withdrawals existing on the date of FLPMA approval, 10/21/76. All of the District withdrawals were existing on that date.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

L1.1

MFP II Multiple Use Recommendations

Review all withdrawn lands for restoration to the full operation of the land laws. These are noted as W-1 through W-8 on the L1-S-1 Overlay, and W-9 through W-15 on the L1-BW-1 Overlay. Complete the withdrawal review by 10/21/91 as required by law. After review recommend restoration to the full operation of the land laws where appropriate.

Rationale

Modified L1.1 as review is a requirement of law. No land use decision as to the recommendation to restore lands to the full operation of the land laws can be made until after the review process has been completed.

An exception to the above statement exists in those areas identified as W-1, W-2, W-3, and W-4 (lands MFP-1 Overlay #L1-S-1). These areas were never withdrawn from full operation of the public lands laws by the Department of Energy.

Multiple Use Analysis

Withdrawal review of all withdrawn lands are required as stated in FLPMA.

Review of all withdrawals existing on the date of FLPMA approval is required as stated in the rationale. Since this action is a requirement of law and since no recommendation can be made until after the review has been made, there are no identified complements or conflicts with other resource values.

L1.1  
MFP III DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION:

Reject the recommendation.

Rationale

The withdrawal review required by FLPMA Sec. 204 also requires that a recommendation be made to determine whether and for how long a withdrawal would be required. An MFP decision is not needed to make the recommendation to restore lands to the full operation of the land laws.

MFP 1

Review all classified lands for restoration to full operation of the land laws. All district lands are classified except those noted as OAE-1 and OAE-2 on the L1-S-1 Overlay.

Rationale:

Classifications orders N-1559, N-1268, N-2711, N-1279, and N-2710 identified various tracts of land for management objectives of the late 1960s. Some of those objectives will be in conflict with objectives which will be identified through this planning process as required by FLPMA Sec. 102 (a)(1). Further Sec. 102 (a)(3) requires review of all classifications effected before enactment of FLPMA and Sec. 202 (d) permits inclusion, modification, or termination of existing classifications in this planning process. All Winnemucca District classifications were existing upon enactment of FLPMA.

MFP II

Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject the recommendation.

Reasons

MFP decision not required to perform classification review planning area wide, however, specific actions in this land use plan will be treated as classifications reviews for the specific areas involved.

P III

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MFP I

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	Lands 1.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: L 1.3

Review all classified lands for restoration to full operation of the land laws. All district lands are classified except those noted as OAE-1 and OAE-2 on the L1-S-1 Overlay.

Rationale:

Classifications orders N-1559, N-1268, N-2711, N-1279, and N-2710 identified various tracts of land for management objectives of the late 1960s. Some of those objectives will be in conflict with objectives which will be identified through this planning process as required by FLPMA Sec. 102 (a)(1). Further Sec. 102 (a)(3) requires review of all classifications effected before enactment of FLPMA and Sec. 202 (d) permits inclusion, modification, or termination of existing classifications in this planning process. All Winnemucca District classifications were existing upon enactment of FLPMA.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Multiple Use Recommendation

Retain the public lands identified below in federal ownership and dispose of these lands under R&PP applications or other appropriate authorities to local government entities as the need for such lands are made apparent through community planning documents.

<u>Township</u>	<u>- Range</u>	<u>- Section</u>	<u>- Acres</u>
36	37	26	320
36	38	15	640
		28	40
		23	640
		27	640
		16	160
		2	240
		27	640
		28	40
		14	640
		26	400
		34	640
		35	480
		32	160
		5	160
		8	260
		22	480
35	37	10	320
		16	600
		22	640
		24	120
		30	120
35	38	2	560
		4	480
		6	480
		8	640
		10	640
TOTAL			11,180

Rationale:

It is unlikely that the private sector cannot accommodate urban growth in the foreseeable future.

Allow the local community to plan for growth and development in an organized and orderly manner with complete development plans prepared at the time of R&PP approval.



L 1.3 (continued)

Support:

Lands

Archeology

Multiple Use Analysis

Complement

Range Management 3.1 - range has made a disposal recommendation for some of the same lands identified in this recommendation, specifically all public lands identified in T. 35 N., R. 38 E., and T. 35 N., R. 37 E.

Watershed 1.2 - 9 sections are within.

Conflict

Watershed 3.5 - Section 15, T. 36 N., R. 38 E., is within the assumed 100 year floodplain.

Watershed 1.2 - 9 sections identified are within municipal watershed.

Watershed 3.4 - 3 sections identified are within areas by 3.4 as having high vegetal soil factor and not recommended for disposal.

Minerals 1.1 & 1.2 - make no land use decision that would interfere with development of economic or strategic or critical minerals.

The identified lands are, in part, within the Harmony Mining District.

Geothermal 5.1 - the lands have been classified by the U.S.G.S. as prospectively valuable for geothermal resources.

Wildlife 1.1 - the identified parcels are immediately adjacent to a deer winter range. Should these lands go into community expansion, there would be a negative impact to this adjacent deer winter range area.

Recreation 2.1 - retain land identified as area of Class A and B quality. Approximately 1/3 of the identified land is classified Class A or B.

Cultural 1.7 - portion of the identified land has been recommended as an ACEC.

The Humboldt County General Plan has identified public lands adjacent to the City of Winnemucca as follows:

"Federally owned (BLM) land adjacent to the city should remain as public land, or be set aside for public use...."

L 1.3 (continued)

The General Plan further defined these lands as those within a three mile radius of the City of Winnemucca.

The PAA (page 27) states that there is current private land available to absorb an additional 24,500 people without requiring additional land. The demand for public lands to facilitate growth of the urban and suburban to population ratio.

The General Plan also has identified a need for an elementary school site in the Grass Valley area.

Support:

Lands

Archeology

1.3

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION:

MFP III

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

In addition, make Lots 6 and 7, Section 6, T. 35 N., R. 38 E., available to Humboldt County for the Grass Valley school site R&PP application #N-32965.

Rationale

The Humboldt County Commission has adopted this MFP II recommendation as their response to Secretary Watt's letter asking for identification of needs for lands for community expansion. This recommendation is consistent with the Humboldt County General Plan.

Lands 1.4

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

The following lands will be retained in public ownership and managed as a dispersion exclusion zone for the liquified natural gas plant near Lovelock, Nevada:

T. 27 N., R. 30 E.,  
Sec. 12 SW1/4, W1/2SE1/4,  
Sec. 14 NE1/4, N1/2SE1/4.

Rationale

Southwest Gas Corporation is concerned that, in the absence of the exclusion zone there could be serious adverse impacts to their facilities. We concur for the following reasons:

1. The exclusion zone will be of negligible, if any, adverse impact on other resources or resource users.
2. The magnitude, cost, and purpose of the LPG facility are all such that it warrants this special consideration.

It is the intention of the BLM to legally control those areas of the dispersion exclusion zone which fall within its jurisdiction, in accordance with 49 CFR Sec. 193.2057 and 49 CFR Sec. 193.2059 for as long as the Lovelock LNG facility is in operation. In the event there is any change in this situation, BLM will notify Southwest Gas Corporation promptly.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

L-2

Objective: L-2

Make public lands available for community and public purposes.

Rationale:

All of the communities in the Resource Area are practically surrounded by public lands. Although private lands are available within each community to meet the small growth expected over the next several years, it can be foreseen, however, that sometime in the future public purpose areas, expansion, and economic development cannot be achieved prudently and feasibly on land other than public land.

Differentiation between lands for recreation and public purpose and for urban-suburban expansion is deliberately avoided since this is more properly a municipal government function. Also, development patterns prior to actual utilization of the public lands could cause any present designations to need changing. Both uses are consistent with Winnemucca and Lovelock general development plans and with anticipated or assumed plans of the unincorporated communities.

The proposed lands are not of national significance (FLPMA Sec. 212[a]) and as proposed would serve important public objectives which would outweigh any other public objectives by maintaining such tracts in federal ownership (FLPMA Sec. 201[a][3]).

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 2.1

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 2.1

Reserve the following public lands in the vicinity of Lovelock, Humboldt, Imlay, Gerlach, and Empire for community expansion and for recreation and public purpose:

<u>Community</u>	<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Sections</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Gerlach	32 N.	23 E.	All	23,040
Empire	31 N.	23 E.	East 1/2 of Township	11,520
Lovelock	27 N.	32 E.	8, 18, 20, 30, 32	3,840
	26 N.	32 E.	6	
Humboldt	32 N.	33 E.	34	640
Imlay	32 N.	34 E.	10	640
			TOTAL	39,680

These lands are noted as XP-1 through XP-3 on the L1-S-1 Overlay, and XP-4 and XP-5 on the L1-BH-1 Overlay.

Rationale:

Due to the land ownership patterns, the future need for public lands for community purposes is a logical assumption. See Rationale L-2.

Support:

1. Appraisal prior to disposal for community expansion.
2. Cultural resource clearance prior to disposal.
3. Resurvey depending on location of existing monuments.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Multiple Use Recommendation

Retain the following listed lands in public ownership until or unless local community R&PP or urban-suburban expansions specific requests have been made by the affected communities. These requests must be identified through the local governmental planning documents.

<u>Community</u>	<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Sections</u>
Gerlach	32 N.	23 E.	All public lands in Section 15, S1/2 Sec. 10, SE1/4 Sec. 16, SE1/4SE1/4 Sec. 9. (Approx. 222.9 acres)
Empire	31 N.	23 E.	All public lands in Sections 10, 11, 14, and 15. (Approx. 2,220 acres)
Lovelock, Imlay, and Humboldt			No identified lands at this time.

Rationale

1. Encourage and allow Pershing County, Washoe County, and their communities through their planning to identify their required land needs so that development is orderly and organized.

No specific requests for identified public lands have been made for Lovelock, Imlay, or Humboldt. The identified lands near Gerlach and Empire are the most logical in which to assume that future community expansion would occur.

These communities are also the most "land locked," while Lovelock, Imlay, and Humboldt have current, adequate private lands in which to expand.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation will be analyzed in parts by the affected community.

Gerlach - There are conflicts with minerals 1.1 and 1.2. Within the township proposed for R&PP or community expansion there is a known deposit of ulexite. Additionally, the area identified in the recommendation is within the Gerlach KGRA. This is in conflict with geothermal recommendation 5.1 and 5.2. Also within the proposed township the U.S.G.S. has classified the area for potential sodium and potassium leasing.

L2. (continued)

A small portion of the Fox and Lake Range Horse Management Area extends into this area, WH&B 1.1.

Wildlife has recommended that a portion of this area be managed as a wildlife management area (WMA) recommendation 1.3 or as an area of critical environmental concern, ACEC recommendation #1.4.

Recreation conflicts include:

- 1.11 Close to ORVs the playa of the Black Rock Desert.
- 2.1 Retain land in identified recreation areas of Class A and B quality - the entire township is rated as Class A and B.
- 3.1 Allow no action to degrade the visual resources - the Gerlach area is classified as Class II.
- 3.2 Retain scenic integrity of the Black Rock Playa, by allowing no development on the playa. Much of this area, 6 sections are on the playa.
- 3.3 Maintain the scenic integrity of the Applegate-Lassen Trail by prohibiting development within view of the trail.

Lands conflicts include:

- 4.1 Designate utility corridors - 3 recommended corridors intersect in the Gerlach area.

Cultural recommendation 1.7 conflict as within the identified township. There are areas recommended as ACECs.

Watershed 3.4 - don't dispose of areas with high soil vegetational factors.

Range recommendation 1.1 - allocate all suitable forage to livestock and 1.4 - develop a grazing management system on the Buffalo Hills and Rodeo Creek Allotment also conflict here.

Much of the land identified for R&PP or community expansion for this area is totally inadequate for this purpose, i.e., (1) the playa of the Black Rock Desert approximately 19 sections within this identified township; (2) steep rugged terrain on the south end of the Granite Mountain Range approximately 2 full sections; (3) 3 1/2 section on the Smoke Creek Desert Playa.

Additionally, the URAs state that "There has been no demand for expansion of the community [Gerlach] and little projected for the future unless there should be increased interest in mining."



L2.4 (continued)

Minerals 1.1 and 1.2 - make no recommendation that would interfere with any economic or strategic or critical mineral development also with M 6.1 as Sec. 6, T. 26 N., R. 32E., has been identified classified by the U.S.G.S. as valuable for sodium and potassium leasing.

Conflicts with geothermal 5.1 general recommendations to make no land use decision that would interfere with geothermal leasing on lands classified as prospectively valuable for geothermal resources.

Recreation 2.1 - retain land identified as areas of Class A and B quality.

Cultural 1.7 - ACEC recommendation conflict with the Humboldt River Route (Old California Trail).

MFP III

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Retain the following lands in public ownership until local community R&PP or urban-suburban expansions specific requests have been made by the affected communities. These requests must be identified through the local governmental planning groups/entities.

<u>Community</u>	<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Sections</u>
Gerlach	32 N.	23 E.	All public lands in Section 15, S1/2 Sec. 10, SE1/4 Sec. 16, SE1/4SE1/4 Sec. 9, Sec. 23. (Approx. 862.0 acres)
Empire	31 N.	23 E.	All public lands in Sections 10, 11, 14, and 15. (Approx. 2,220 acres)
Lovelock, Imlay, and Humboldt	27 N.	32 E.	Sec. 30 NE1/4SE1/4 for sanitary fill Sec. 30, Sec. 20, Sec. 32, and Sec. 28 (Approx. 2,600 acres)

Rationale

Same as MFP II.

L3.) (continued)

The PAA does not identify specific urban-suburban needs for more land near this community, however it does state that one local resident is planning on subdividing his land.

Additionally, the PAA information states assuming full development of the geothermal resources near Gerlach would increase employment by 42 persons. PAA (page 28), "Gerlach is a town of approximately 110 acres, 30 of which are vacant. . . . Vacant land within the town is sufficient to meet demand into the near future and little pressure for release of public lands through the current planning period is expected."

Obviously there are no pressing current needs for community expansion at Gerlach.

Empire - Many of the same conflicts as identified in the Gerlach Multiple Use Analysis also impact the Empire expansion recommendation. Specifically, the same conflicts are minerals 1.1, 1.2, 6.1, geothermal 5.1, 5.2 Gerlach KGRA also in this area. Range 1.1-1.4, wild horse and burro 1.1 even more so than at Gerlach, watershed 3.4.

The URAs BW-L-4 state, "There does not appear to be any potential for urban-suburban growth in the planning area."

The PAA (page 28) stated in reference to Empire that, "No demand for release of public land for use by the community is anticipated."

There was an airport lease application filed in 1976 for some 320 acres adjacent to Empire for a public airport. No action has been taken on this application to date.

U.S. Gypsum Plant Manager Larry Liech has stated that the idea of retaining public land adjacent to Empire for future possible R&PP or community expansion needs would be desirable.

#### Lovelock

#### Complement

None.

#### Conflict

Watershed 3.5 - parts of 5 sections identified are within the designated 100-year floodplain on the Humboldt River.

Lands 3.3 - conflict with agricultural lease or disposal recommendation.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity  
Lands 2.2

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 2.2

MFP I

Reserve the following lands in the vicinity of Winnemucca for community purposes.

<u>Township</u>	<u>- Range</u>	<u>- Section</u>	<u>- Acres</u>
36	37	26	320
36	38	15	640
		28	40
		23	640
		27	640
		16	160
		2	240
		27	640
		28	40
		14	640
		26	400
		34	640
		35	480
		32	160
		5	160
		8	260
		22	480
35	37	10	320
		16	600
		22	640
		24	120
		30	120
35	38	2	560
		4	480
		6	480
		8	640
		10	640
		TOTAL	11,180

These lands are noted as XP-6 on the L1-S-1 Overlay.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Multiple Use Recommendation

Dispose of these identified public lands only under R&PP applications or other appropriate authorities to local government entities as the specific lands are identified and the need for such lands is made apparent through community planning documents.

<u>Township</u>	<u>- Range</u>	<u>- Section</u>	<u>- Acres</u>
36	37	26	320
36	38	15	640
		28	40
		23	640
		27	640
		16	160
		2	240
		27	640
		28	40
		14	640
		26	400
		34	640
		35	480
		32	160
		5	160
		8	260
35	37	22	480
		10	320
		16	600
		22	640
		24	120
		30	120
35	38	2	560
		4	480
		6	480
		8	640
		10	640
TOTAL			11,180

Rationale:

It is unlikely that the private sector cannot accommodate urban growth in the foreseeable future.

Allow the local community to plan for growth and development in an organized and orderly manner with complete development plans prepared at the time of R&PP approval.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale. In addition, make Lots 6 and 7 Sec. 6 T. 35 N., R. 38 E., available to Humboldt County for the Grass Valley school site R&PP application #N32965.

Rationale

The Humboldt County Commission has adopted this MFP II recommendations as their response to Secretary Watt's letter asking for identification of needs for lands for community expansion. This recommendation is consistent with the Humboldt County General Plan.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	Sonoma-Gerlach
Activity	
Lands	2.3
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: L 2.3

MFP | Reserve public lands for the orderly growth and development of Rye Patch State Park. These lands are noted as R & PP on the L1-S-1 Overlay.

Rationale:

Outdoor Recreation has identified an opportunity and need for increased water-oriented recreation at Rye Patch under State administration. The Water and Power Administration (WPA, formerly Bureau of Reclamation) has purchased all inundated or potential high water land, but the lake shore is in the familiar checkerboard pattern. Full utilization of the lands within the legislated Park boundary will require use of public lands. Officials of the Nevada Department of State Parks have verbally requested that these public lands be reserved and protected for park purposes. Some of these public lands have already been withdrawn by WPA and are discussed further under L 1.2 above.

Support:

1. Cultural resource clearance.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

## L 2.3

Multiple Use Recommendations

Retain for recreational purposes the lands listed below and all public lands adjacent to reclamation withdrawn lands or to Rye Patch Reservoir on the west of the reservoir in public ownership.

T. 32 N., R. 32 E., Sec. 24,	360 acres
Sec. 25,	360 acres
Sec. 27,	640 acres
Sec. 35,	640 acres
Sec. 2,	40 acres
Sec. 10,	460 acres
Sec. 15,	640 acres
Sec. 27,	<u>640 acres</u>
Subtotal	3,140 acres
 T. 32 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 6,	120 acres
Sec. 7,	360 acres
Sec. 18,	440 acres
Sec. 30,	<u>120 acres</u>
Subtotal	1,040 acres
 T. 33 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 19,	640 acres
Sec. 21,	640 acres
Sec. 26,	560 acres
Sec. 32,	<u>320 acres</u>
Subtotal	2,160 acres
 T. 31 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 8,	80 acres
Sec. 20,	320 acres
Sec. 32,	<u>480 acres</u>
Subtotal	880 acres
 T. 30 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 6,	120 acres
Sec. 8,	<u>640 acres</u>
Subtotal	760 acres
 Grand Total of Acres	7,980

## L 2.3 (continued)

### Support

ATROW Cultural

### Multiple Use Analysis

#### Complement

Recreation 1.5 - block up public lands and turn over to state parks under R&PP.

#### Conflict

Mineral 6.1 - the area has been identified by U.S.G.S. as prospectively valuable for sodium and potassium leasing.

Mineral 1.1 and 1.2 - make no land use decision that would interfere with the development of economic, strategic, and/or critical minerals.

Geothermal 5.1 - make no land use decision that would interfere with development of geothermal resources on areas classified as prospectively valuable by the U.S.G.S. for geothermal development.

Watershed 3.4 - do not dispose of lands with a high soil vegetal factor.

Watershed 3.5 - do not dispose of lands within the 100-year floodplain.

Wildlife 1.8 - improve and maintain all riparian areas.

Cultural 1.7 - portion of the Humboldt River Route Emigrant Trail ACEC designation.

Major portions of the Rye Patch Recreation Development Plan have been implemented on private or state park managed land to date. (See Rye Patch Reservoir General Recreation Development Plan, 1974.)

This plan indicates that only two proposed sites (Majuba Bay Fishermen's Access and Poker Brown Beach) would affect public land. Callahan Bridge Campsite is on State Park managed land and Pitt-Taylor Cave is on private land.

This general development plan identified both sites connected with public land as "Informal Day and Overnight Use."

Additional public lands would be involved as far as access into proposed development sites.



L 2.3 (continued)

The Pershing County General Plan recommends continued expansion of the facilities at Rye Patch State Park but does not suggest that acquisition of public lands are required for this expansion.

L 2.3 (continued)

Support

ATROW Cultural

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION:

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

MFP III

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 2.4

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 2.4

MFP 1  
As public lands are identified for disposal through this planning process, attempt to exchange them for private lands within the Rye Patch boundary and the Lahontan Natural Area in order to consolidate public lands within these two important public use areas.

Rationale:

Other specialists in this planning process have identified these two areas as important for recreation and habitat. Private landholdings within these areas complicate management and could possibly contribute to uses detrimental to area values. The most economical and logical management of the Park area would be with State ownership of all of the lands within the legislated boundary. The present land ownership pattern of intermingled public and private lands does not permit good layout of public access roads and visitor use facilities. Some of the private lands preclude public access.

Support:

1. Appraisal

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

MFP 11

L 2.4

Multiple Use Recommendations

As public lands are identified for disposal through this planning process, attempt to exchange them for private lands within the Rye Patch boundary and the Lahontan Natural Area in order to consolidate public lands within these two important public use areas.

Rationale

Acquisition by exchange would allow or create a blocked public land status of that would facilitate management of these important areas.

This recommendation is compatible with Paradise-Denio Lands L 2.1 Multiple Use Recommendations.

Support

Appraisal

MFP 111

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION:

As sites are identified and/or need or opportunity arises--acquire by exchange or other means those private lands intermingled with public lands that contain high resource values within the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Natural Area.

Rationale:

The Rye Patch area was dropped from this recommendation because we cannot acquire lands that have a high possibility of being disposed of to other agencies like state parks. The Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Natural Area has very high wildlife, recreation and other values. Management of this area would be much less complicated and the area can be better protected if it is all in public ownership.

The Nature Conservancy has expressed an interest in obtaining this portion of the Soldier Meadows Ranch. This recommendation is compatible with their interest.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 2.6

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 2.5

MFP I

As public lands are identified for disposal through this planning process, attempt to exchange them for private lands within the identified watersheds in order to consolidate public lands within these important public service areas.

Rationale:

Activities on private lands within these watersheds could be detrimental to water quality and availability. Private lands can be zoned for watersheds and somewhat controlled. However, such restrictions are resented by private landholders and zoning is always subject to political variances. Governmental control of these lands would give the communities better control and protection of land uses for watersheds.

Support:

1. Appraisal

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Multiple Use Recommendation

MFP II

Retain in public ownership or acquire into public ownership the following lands within the municipal hydrologic basins described as follows:

Winnemucca

hydrologic basin for  
Water Canyon Creek

T. 35 N., R. 38 E.,  
Section 2, S1/2  
Section 11, E1/2  
Section 14, 13, and 12  
T. 35 N., R. 39 E.,  
Sections 7, 18, 19, 20, and 17 = 5,760 acres

Golconda

hydrologic basin for  
Pole Creek

T. 35 N., R. 39 E.  
Sections 32, 27, 28, 29, 20  
21, 22, 23, 13, 14, 15, 16  
12, and 7  
Section 33, N1/2  
Section 34, N1/2  
Section 26, NW1/4  
= 9,760 acres

Imlay

hydrologic basin for  
Prince Royal Canyon

T. 32 N., R. 34 E.  
Section 28, SW1/4  
Section 29, SE1/4  
Section 33, W1/2  
Section 32, E1/2  
T. 31 N., R. 34 E.  
Section 3, W1/2  
Section 4, E1/2  
Section 8, SE1/4  
Section 17, NE1/4  
Section 14, N1/2, N1/2, S1/2  
Section 15, NW1/4  
Sections 9 and 10  
= 3,840 acres

Priority in management of these municipal watersheds will be for the protection of the surface water quality and quantity within these hydrologic basins. Uses identified as causing unacceptable water quality problems will not be permitted to continue.

Rationale

Identified municipal watershed in this multiple use recommendation involve only those communities that depend/or may depend/in part upon surface water for municipal needs. In addition, authorized uses of public lands within these hydrologic basins can impact the quality of water in these hydrologic basins.

Specific identified incompatible uses have not been identified to date.

## L 2.5 (continued)

### Multiple Use Analysis

#### Winnemucca

#### Complement

Forestry 1.1 - design grazing management systems to meet the physiological requirements of aspen on the following allotments:

Thomas Creek  
Harmony  
Diamond S

Watershed 1.1 - prevent BLM activities from degrading the water quality standards. Employ best management practices in all public lands activities.

Watershed 1.2 - protect the water quality within municipal watersheds used by the communities of Lovelock, Golconda, Imlay, Gerlach, Empire and Winnemucca by (1) reserving the public land within these watersheds and (2) acquire private lands in these watershed into public ownership.

Reserve is deferred as retention of public lands, protection by withdrawal for mineral entry, and management for compatible use.

Watershed 3.2 - encourage maximum vegetation cover by limiting the use of vegetation by grazing animals to proper use levels as recommended in the Proper Use Tables referred to in NSO Memo 76-167.

Watershed 3.1 - establish as a goal of all grazing management plans to increase ground cover to at least 70% in order to reduce or eliminate accelerated erosion.

Watershed 3.4 - prohibit land disposals, any land treatment or disturbance activities which would likely result in significant reduction. The amount of vegetative cover in areas designated as having a "high" erosion susceptibility, or "high" soil-vegetal factor.

Wildlife 1.5 - classify the riparian areas along major streams as ACECs.

In the Winnemucca identified watershed, the following recommended ACEC streams were found - Thomas Creek, Water Canyon Creek, and Harmony Canyon Creek.

Wildlife 1.8 - improve riparian habitat and once improved maintain riparian habitat in good or excellent condition.

## L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife 1.7 - do not stock pastures (with livestock) above their estimated carrying capacity.

Wildlife 1.9 - improve or maintain the condition of 3,750 acres of aspen habitat in the planning area. (Significant amounts of aspen occur in the proposed watershed.)

Wildlife 1.10 - improve and maintain the condition of meadow habitat.

Wildlife 1.24 - limit off-road vehicle use during the lambing season in bighorn sheep use areas as reintroductions are made, and in other crucial wildlife habitats as they are identified.

Wildlife 1.25 - limit new trail or road construction on potential bighorn sheep range to minimize access.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1 - designate riparian areas and fishable and nonfishable streams as ACECs.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.7 - improve water quality of streams, lakes and reservoirs used as fish habitat.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.8 - prevent the use of water from streams capable of supporting a sport fishery for mining and milling. Control the construction of mine roads along riparian stream zones. Protect water filings on streams by mining interests.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.12 - that road on all resource area streams be water barred to prevent erosion.

Cultural 1.7 - designate all high probability areas identified on URM. Overlay 1 as ACECs.

### Conflict

Minerals 1.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the development of "Strategic and Critical Materials" which occur on public lands or other federally owned minerals within the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area.

Minerals 1.2 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the potential development of economically important minerals occurring on public lands or other federally owned minerals within mining districts or other areas outside of designated mining districts.

Geothermal 5.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with or prevent geothermal leasing, exploration, and/or development on public lands, or any other lands containing federally owned minerals, classified



## L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife 1.7 and 1.8 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.9 - same as Winnemucca except that aspen areas occur in the Pole Creek drainage.

Wildlife 1.11 - protect sage grouse strutting grounds and the area within two miles of each strutting ground. In addition, give consideration to strutting grounds and associated use areas in other types of projects.

Wildlife 1.24 and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.12 - same as Winnemucca.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

### Conflict

Minerals 1.1 and 1.2 = same as Winnemucca.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Wild Horse and Burro 1.1 - designate the Diamond S Allotment as a HMA. This proposal involves over 50% of the identified Golconda watershed.

Wild Horse and Burro 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

As stated in the Winnemucca analysis local concerns have been expressed in regards to the protection of this community's watershed.

The URAs identify a suspected water quality problem in this watershed (#009) and have identified probable causes as gully erosion and, forage utilization practices.

The specific area that is the practical source for this community's water supply is the Pole Creek hydrologic basin. Specifically this area involves all or part of 17 sections, rather than the 30 identified in the Step 1 recommendation. Over 50% of the lands in this hydrologic basin are private in ownership.

### Humboldt

#### Complement

Wild Horse and Burro 1.3 - remove all wild horses and burros from the Humboldt HUA/checkerboard land.

Watershed 1.1, 3.1, and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife 1.7, 1.8, 1.24, and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Recreation 1.8 - designate the Star Peak area as an ACEC, a portion of this area is within the identified watershed.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

Conflict

Minerals 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Minerals 1.4 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the potential development of economically important minerals occurring on public lands or other federally owned minerals within the following areas: within the Imlay Mining District.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Forestry 2.1 - establish a fuel wood harvest area. This involves 5 sections within the identified Humboldt Watershed area.

Wild Horse and Burro 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

Multiple Use Analysis (Humboldt)

This is currently a nonviable community, a historic mining town, with no permanent population.

Imlay

Complement

Wild Horse and Burro 1.3 - same as Humboldt.

Watershed 1.1, 1.2, 3.1, and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.5 - same as Winnemucca except that this identified watershed contain portions of Star Creek.

Wildlife 1.7, 1.8, 1.24, and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.12 - same as Winnemucca.

Recreation 1.8 - same as Humboldt.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

Conflict

Minerals 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Minerals 1.4 - same as Humboldt except that the areas are:

Humboldt Range - Imlay Mining District proposed watershed includes gold, silver, & copper and the Star Mining District - Tehama Mine - copper, silver & gold.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Wild Horse and Burro 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

Source of municipal water supply are springs in upper Prince Royal Canyon. No identified request or recommendations have been received from local officials regarding the protection of this watershed. However, community growth is expected as a result of new and expanded mining activity in the area. This should place additional demands upon the community water supply.

Unionville

Complement

Wild Horse and Burro 1.3 - same as Humboldt.

Watershed 1.1, 3.1, and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.5 - same as Winnemucca except that the major stream in this watershed is Buena Vista Creek.

Wildlife 1.7 and 1.8 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.9 - same as Winnemucca only significant aspen in this identified watershed.

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

Wildlife 1.24 and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

## L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife Awuatic 1.1, 1.7, and 1.8 - same as Winnemucca.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

### Conflict

Mining 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Mining 1.3 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the potential development of "Strategic and Critical" materials occurring on public lands or other federally owned minerals within the following areas: Unionville Mining District containing antimony, tungsten, copper, and lead.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Wild Horse and burro 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

This community of people is served by individual, privately owned springs and wells.

The "Nevada Rural Communities Water and Waste Water Plan 1972, Volume IV" identifies the fact that the creek water that runs through this community is contaminated from sheep grazing and therefore is an unreliable source of supply for municipal use.

Through this planning period it is expected that the individual well sources will be adequate for community needs.

### Lovelock

#### Complement

Wild Horse and Burro 1.3 - same as Humboldt.

Watershed 1.1, 1.2, 3.2, and 3.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Watershed 3.4 = same as Winnemucca except that 5 sections with the identified watershed are classified as "high" erosion susceptibility.

Wildlife 1.5 - same as Winnemucca except that major stream areas within the identified watershed area:

Rocky Canyon Creek  
Cottonwood Canyon Creek  
Indian Canyon Creek

Wildlife 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 1.24, and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

L 2.5 (continued)

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.12 - same as Winnemucca.

Cultural - same as Winnemucca.

Conflict

Mining 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Mining 1.3 - same as Unionville except that the area is Rye Patch Mining District containing tungsten and beryllium.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Wild Horse and Burros 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

Existing municipal water source/supply for this community of 1,700 people use wells located in the Oreana well field, 15 miles north of Lovelock.

There is no surface supply of municipal water to Lovelock.

Gerlach

Complement

Forestry 1.1 - same as Winnemucca except that the affected allotment is the Buffalo Hills.

Watershed 1.1, 1.2, 3.1, and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.5 - same as Winnemucca except that identified watershed contains portions of Clear Creek.

Wildlife 1.7, 1.8, 1.24, and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.9 - same as Winnemucca except some aspen identified on eastern edge of identified watershed.

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1, 1.8, and 1.12 - same as Winnemucca.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

Conflict

Minerals 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

## L 2.5 (continued)

Minerals 6.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the leasing and development of lands classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as being prospectively valuable for sodium and potassium, the identified watershed has 3 sections in this category.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Geothermal 5.2 - offer the following KGRAs for competitive leasing as soon as possible.

1. Soldier Meadows
2. Double Hot Springs
3. Trego
4. Gerlach
5. Gerlach Northeast
6. Fly Ranch
7. Fly Ranch Northeast
8. San Emidio Desert
9. Brady Hazen

The Gerlach KGRA is within the identified watershed.

Wild Horse and Burros 1.1 - designate the Granite Range Herd Management Area. Approximately 6 sections of the identified Gerlach watershed is within this proposed HMA, also one section of this proposed watershed is within the proposed Buffalo Hills HMA.

Wild Horse and Burros 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

This town's water supply currently is a group of springs located on private land. The flow is then piped into the community.

### Empire

#### Complement

Watershed 1.1 and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Watershed 3.4 - same as Winnemucca except that approximately 20% of the identified watershed is classified as "high" soil-vegetal factor.

Wildlife 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, 1.24, and 1.25 - same as Winnemucca.

Wildlife 1.11 - same as Golconda.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Cultural 1.7 - same as Winnemucca.

## L 2.5 (continued)

by the U.S. Geological Survey as Prospectively Valuable for Geothermal Resources, or land classified as Known Geothermal Resource Areas (KGRA).

Wild Horses and Burros 1.1 - designate the Diamond S Allotment as a horse management area, approximately 8 sections on the eastern edge of this identified watershed is within this proposed HMA.

Wild Horses and Burros 1.4 - make all water that is presently found on public land available for wild horse and burro use. All waters that are available to horse or cattle in herd use areas will remain available yearlong for horse use.

Develop a water distribution system that is suited for horse use and compatible with wildlife use. All new water developments within HMAs or HUAs will be required to use this system.

The actual hydrologic basin that supplies the water for the Winnemucca area involves portions of 10 sections rather than the approximate two townships identified in this recommendation.

The URA indicates that the Winnemucca Watershed (Watershed #004) does currently have suspected water quality problems. The URA further identifies the suspected probable causes as (1) off-road vehicle use, (2) mineral exploration, (3) gully erosion, and (4) forage utilization practices.

Concerns have been identified by local individuals (Mr. Matt Morris, Humboldt County Planner and Mr. Jack Thomas, local Manager of California Pacific) expressing a need for the protection of the municipal watersheds for Winnemucca and Golconda.

Sources of municipal water for this community of 5,000 people (7,500 in outlying areas) are 5 wells and surface flow from Water Canyon Creek.

### Golconda

#### Complement

Forestry - same as Winnemucca except that also include Rock Creek Allotment.

Watershed 1.1, 1.2, 3.1, and 3.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Watershed 3.4 - same as Winnemucca except that in the identified Golconda watershed approximately 50% of all land is classified as "high" erosion susceptibility.

Wildlife 1.5 - same as Winnemucca except that major riparian areas in this identified watershed are: Pole Creek and upper portion of Harmony Canyon Creek.

For additional disposal recommendation see:

Range Management 3.1



L 2.5 (continued)

Conflict

Mining 1.1 and 1.2 - same as Winnemucca.

Geothermal 5.1 - same as Winnemucca.

Wild Horses and burros 1.2 - establish Herd Use Areas (HUAs) in 11 areas for extensive management of wild horses and burros. The entire Empire identified watershed is within the proposed Selenite Range HUA.

Wild Horses and Burros 1.4 - same as Winnemucca.

This town's municipal water supply is from deep wells adjacent to the community on private land. Surface flow is not involved. The action taken on adjacent public land would have little if any effect on the quality and or quantity of this municipal water supply.

MFP III DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Retain in public ownership the following lands within the municipal hydrologic basins described as follows. Non-public lands in these municipal watersheds will be given priority for acquisition.

Winnemucca  
hydrologic basin for  
Water Canyon Creek

T. 35 N., R. 38 E.,  
Section 2, S1/2  
Sections 12 and 14

T. 35 N., R. 39 E.,  
Sections 7, 18, and 17

Golconda  
hydrologic basin for  
Pole Creek

T. 35 N., R. 39 E.  
Sections 32, 28, 20, and 23  
Section 14, N1/2, SW1/4, N1/2 SE1/4  
Section 16, N1/2, N1/2 S1/2  
Sections 12 and 7  
Section 34, N1/2  
Section 26, NW1/4

Imlay  
hydrologic basin for  
Prince Royal Canyon

T. 32 N., R. 34 E.  
Section 28, SW1/4  
Section 32, E1/2  
  
T. 31 N., R. 34 E.  
Section 4, Lot 1, Lot 2, SE1/4 SE1/4, SW1/4,  
SE1/4  
Section 8, SE1/4  
Section 14, N1/2, N1/2, S1/2  
Section 10

Lovelock

T. 29 N., R. 33 E.  
Section 28, S1/2, SE1/4 NE1/4, W1/2 NW1/4, SE1/4  
NW1/4  
Sections 33 and 34.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 2.5

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 2.5 (continued)

	<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
Gerlach (WS-6)	33 N.	23 E.	Secs. 6-8, 16-18, 19-21, 27-29, 30-34	10,880
	33 N.	22 E.	Secs. 1-3, 10-14, 23-25	7,680
	34 N.	22 E.	Secs. 25-27, 34-36	<u>3,840</u>
			Sub-Total	22,400
Humboldt (WS-7)	31 N.	33 E.	Secs. 1, 2, 11, 12	2,560
	32 N.	33 E.	Secs. 35, 36	1,280
	31 N.	34 E.	Secs. 5-8, 17, 18	3,840
	32 N.	34 E.	Sec. 31	<u>640</u>
			Sub-Total	8,320
Unionville (WS-8)	30 N.	34 E.	Secs. 21-23, 26-29, 32-35	7,040
			Sub-Total	<u>7,040</u>
			TOTAL	157,840 ac.

Rationale:

Water Resources has identified a need for protection of the watersheds of these communities. All of them except Winnemucca and Empire are presently using water from these watersheds for community uses. These two communities have used surface water from their respective watersheds in the past but are now using deep wells. Lowering water tables, salinity and energy costs for deep well pumping may force them to revert to surface water use from these watersheds. No other lands are available to these communities as a water source or recharge of wells. Protection of these lands are vital if these communities are to survive, and all have verbally requested reservation of these watersheds. Such use would serve important public objectives (FLPMA Sec. 203(a)(31)).

Support:

1. Soil - Water - Fire

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

Mistakes in MFP land descriptions

~~F. 35N. R.~~

42.5 Winnemucca

T. 35N. R. 38E.

Section 2, lot 7, SE $\frac{1}{4}$  SW $\frac{1}{4}$  -- private  
(public land should be described as  
lot 6, NE $\frac{1}{4}$  SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ )

~~Sec. 2 mentioned twice~~

Calconda

T. 35N. R. 38E.

Sec. 28 N $\frac{1}{2}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$  S $\frac{1}{2}$  -- private (public  
S $\frac{1}{2}$  S $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Sec. 20 N $\frac{1}{2}$  NE $\frac{1}{4}$  -- private (public  
S $\frac{1}{2}$  NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Sec. 23 -- all private

Sec. 34 -- all private

## L 2.5 (continued)

Priority in management of these municipal watersheds will be for the protection of the surface or subsurface water quality and quantity within these hydrologic basins. Uses identified as causing unacceptable water quality problems will not be allowed.

Activity planning that affects the vegetative resource or causes surface disturbance will receive high priority. Activity plans will be carefully coordinated so that the watershed values are considered. The CRMP process is desirable on these watersheds. Special attention will be paid to mining, mineral sales, and mineral leasing activities in these areas.

### Rationale

Same as MFP II.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

L-3

Objective: L-3

Make suitable public lands available for agricultural disposal and lease.

Rationale:

Annually thousands of acres of prime agricultural lands are lost to urban-suburban development, yet the nation's demand for food and fiber is increasing because of the increasing population. This may eventually force into production all possible agricultural lands.

Congress has made clear its intention to put suitable public lands into agricultural production when (1) it declined to repeal the Desert Land Entry and Carey Acts, (2) although it established a policy of retention of public lands, it also made provision for agricultural entry of qualifying contemplated disposals (FLPMA Sec. 203[b]), (3) when it made provision for long-term leases for cultivation (FLPMA Sec. 302 [b]), and (4) when it referred to the size of tracts to be sold that are judged to be chiefly valuable for agriculture (FLPMA Sec. 203[e]).

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

## MFP I

### Recommendation: L 3.1

Review all land classifications for continued classification need with a view to restoring the lands to possible appropriation under the agricultural laws limited only by economic and physical conditions on a case-by-case basis.

### Rationale:

The original classification primarily was for retention of the public lands which is now policy in FLPMA sec. 102 (a)(1). This classification removed most of the Resource Area from agricultural entry, yet small isolated areas within that classification are known to exist with soil conditions conducive to agricultural production. Other areas may possibly exist. Water, although a limiting factor at present, could possibly be made available to these areas in the future through water conservation techniques or new unknown sources.

This review is required by FLPMA Sec. 102 (a)(3), and Sec. 202 (d) subjects all lands, regardless of classification, to inclusion in this planning process.

### Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject the recommendation.

### Reasons

MFP decisions not required to perform classification review planning area wide, however, specific actions in this land use plan will be treated as classification reviews for the specific areas involved.

Current DLE applications are being handled as if the application was a petition for classification review.

Carey Act applications will be processed in a similar manner. In disposal actions via sale FLPMA Section 203(a) states, " . . . where such tract which is judged by the Secretary to be chiefly valuable for agriculture is sold, its size shall be no larger than necessary to support a family sized farm," and FLPMA Section 203(b), "Where the Secretary determines that land to be conveyed under clause (3) of subsection (a) of this section is of agricultural value and is desert in character, such land shall be conveyed either under the sale authority of this section or in accordance with other existing laws."

## MFP III

### DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

MFP I

Recommendation: L 3.2

Prior to any disposal or long-term commitment of public lands to uses inconsistent with agriculture, review them for agricultural potential and retain those so identified for agricultural lease or agricultural disposal. This determination is to be made on a case-by-case basis prior to any disposal.

Rationale:

Although this review and agricultural use of qualifying lands is not mandated by Congress, it is clearly inferred by FLPMA Sec. 203 (b) and (e). Agricultural leases are, also, permitted by FLPMA Sec. 302 (b).

Support:

1. Soils survey.
2. Cadastral survey prior to disposal.

MFP II

Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject the recommendation.

Reasons

Prior to any disposal action or long-term commitment of public lands to uses inconsistent with agriculture, a review of agricultural potential is policy under FLPMA 203(b) and (e), and normal Bureau procedures through the EA and/or EIS process. This agricultural potential will be analyzed on a case by case basis.

FP III

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 3.3

Dispose of or lease the following agricultural lands contingent upon verification of agricultural potential with a soils analysis and water availability:

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
34 N.	38 E.	6	All	640
			All	640
		20	NW 1/4	160
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
33 N.	38 E.	18	N 1/2	320
			SE 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
		20	All	640
			S 1/2	320
		32	S 1/2 N 1/2	160
			S 1/2	320
			NE 1/4	160
33 N.	37 E.	36	All	640
		24	W 1/2	320
		14	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4	160
34 N.	37 E.	34	All	640
		28	All	640
		16	All	640

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres
35 N.	37 E.	12	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		14	SE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			NE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			S 1/4	160
		20	NW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		22	N 1/2	320
		24	N 1/2	320
		28	All	640
		32	All	640
34 N.	36 E.	6	All	640
34 N.	36 E.	6	All	640
34 N.	35 E.	12	W 1/2	320
		24	E 1/2	320
		36	S 1/2	320
			NW 1/4	160
32 N.	36 E.	10	All	640
		20	N 1/4	160
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
31 N.	35 E.	24	All	640
		36	All	640

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
34 N.	35 E.	10	E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		14	W 1/2	320
		22	W 1/4	160
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		34	SE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
33 N.	35 E.	2	All	640
		4	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 E 1/2	160
		8	All	640
		16	W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4	160
		20	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		28	W 1/2	320
		32	NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
31 N.	35 E.	6	All	640
		16	NE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
		19	S 1/2 NW 1/4	80
		30	All	640
33 N.	34 E.	20	All	640
		22	All	640
		24	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4	160

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
		26	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			N 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		28	N 1/4	160
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
		30	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
		36	E 1/2 W 1/2	160
			E 1/2	320
32 N.	34 E.	5	N 1/4	160
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			S 1/4	160
		10	W 1/2	320
		12	All	640
		14	All	640
		16	All	640
		18	All	640
32 N.	34-1/2 E	1	All	120
		12	All	120
33 N.	34-1/2 E	24	All	120
		25	All	120
		36	All	120
32 N.	33 E.	1	All	640
33 N.	33 E.	24	All	640
		25	N 1/2	320
			SE 1/4	160

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres
30 N.	35 E.	7	E 1/4	160
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		11	N 1/2	320
		18	All	640
		30	W 1/4	160
30 N.	33 E.	4	All	640
		6	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		8	All	640
		16	NE 1/4	160
		18	W 1/2	320
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		30	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
29 N.	33 E.	6	W 1/4	160
		28	S 1/2	320
			W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
28 N.	33 E.	6	S 1/2	320
28 N.	32 E.	2	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		10	SE 1/4	160
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
		12	NW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/2	320

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1690-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

**Sonoma-Gerlach**

Activity

**Lands 3.3**

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
		14	All	640
		16	NW 1/4	160
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		20	N 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		22	S 1/2	320
			S 1/2 N 1/2	160
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		34	All	640
27 N.	32 E.	4	All	480
26 N.	32 E.	8	E 1/2	320
		16	All	640
		20	E 1/2	320
		30	SE 1/4	160
		32	All	640
25 N.	32 E.	6	All	480
25 N.	31 E.	28	All	600
26 N.	31 E.	6	W 1/2	320
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			W 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		8	W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
		36	SE 1/4	160
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
27 N.	31 E.	4	W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		30	E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			S 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres
28 N.	31 E.	26	NW 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			W 1/2 SE 1/4	80
30 N.	35 E.	12	NE 1/4	160
		13	All	640
30 N.	23 E.	19	All	640
		30	All	640
		31	All	640
		18	All	640
30 N.	22 E.	12	All	640
		13	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
		24	E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4	160
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		25	W 1/2	320
		36	All	640
34 N.	23 E.	23	NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		24	E 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		25	E 1/4	160
		1	NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		12	SE 1/4	160
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)  
**Sonoma-Gerlach**

Activity  
**Lands 3.3**

Overlay Reference

Step 1 Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres
35 N.	23 E.	11	E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4	160
		14	All	640
		23	W 1/4	160
		36	E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
36 N.	23 E.	36	E 1/2	320
			SW 1/4	160
			E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
26 N.	38 E.	25	All	640
		26	All	640
		32	N 1/2	320
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		33	All	640
		34	All	640
		36	All	640
25 N.	38 E.	1	All	640
		2	All	640
		3	All	640
		5	All	640
		8	All	640
		9	All	640
		10	All	640
		12	All	640
26 N.	39 E.	19	All	640
		29	N 1/2	320
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

Instructions on reverse

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (V/P)

Sonoma-Carlach

Activity

Lands 3.3

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

L 3.3 (continuation)

Township	Range	Section	Subdivision	Acres
		30	E 1/2	320
		31	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 E 1/2	
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	
		32	SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4	160
			E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4	160
25 N.	39 E.	5	All	640
		7	All	640
		8	E 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SW 1/4	40

61,720

These lands are rated as AG-1 through AG- on the L1-S-1, L1-BW-1, and L1-BH-1 Overlays.

Rationale:

Soils data is not adequate for determination of specific suitability for agriculture; however, these lands are located adjacent to or are in close proximity to known producing agriculture lands, so are probably suitable for agricultural use. Also, due to the economics involved, new agricultural operations may be limited to expansion of existing operations. Water may not now be available, but could be at some future date due to transfers or new sources.

Support:

1. Soils analysis.
2. Water

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)



<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
34 N.	37 E.	34	All	640
		28	All	640
		16	All	640
35 N.	37 E.	12	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		14	SE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			NE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			S 1/4	160
		20	NW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/4	160
			N 1/2 NE 1/4	80
		22	N 1/2	320
		24	N 1/2	320
		28	All	640
		32	All	640
34 N.	36 E.	6	All	640
34 N.	35 E.	12	W 1/2	320
		24	E 1/2	320
		36	S 1/2	320
			NW 1/4	160
32 N.	36 E.	10	All	640
		20	N 1/4	160
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
31 N.	35 E.	24	All	640
		36	All	640
34 N.	35 E.	10	E 1/2 <sup>W</sup> SE 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		14	W 1/2	320
		22	W 1/4	160
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		34	SE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40

## L 3.3 (continuation)

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
		30	E 1/2	320
		31	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 E 1/2	
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	
		32	SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4	160
			E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4	160
25 N.	39 E.	5	All	640
		7	All	640
		8	E 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
				61,720

These lands are rated as AG-1 through AG- on the L1-S-1, L1-BW-1, and L1-BH-1 Overlays.

Rationale:

Soils data is not adequate for determination of specific suitability for agriculture; however, these lands are located adjacent to or are in close proximity to known producing agriculture lands, so are probably suitable for agricultural use. Also, due to the economics involved, new agricultural operations may be limited to expansion of existing operations. Water may not now be available, but could be at some future date due to transfers or new sources.

Support:

1. Soils analysis.
2. Water

Multiple Use Recommendation

Make the lands identified available for agricultural disposal by means of DLE or Carey Act applications and subsequent normal processing procedures on those applications with the following exceptions of: (1) those lands identified in the Multiple Use Recommendation L 2.2, these lands have been identified for retention pending community expansion through RSPP applications; and (2) those public lands adjacent to or touching the Humboldt River.

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
33 N.	35 E.	2	All	640
		4	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 E 1/2	160
		8	All	640
		16	W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4	160
		20	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		28	W 1/2	320
		32	NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
31 N.	35 E.	6	All	640
		16	NE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
		19	S 1/2 NW 1/4	80
		30	All	640
33 N.	34 E.	20	All	640
		22	All	640
		24	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			W 1/2 NE 1/2	80
			SE 1/4	160
		26	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			N 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		28	N 1/4	160
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
		30	N 1/4	160
			SW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
		36	E 1/2 W 1/2	160
			E 1/2	320
32 N.	34 E.	5	N 1/4	160
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			S 1/4	160
		10	W 1/2	320
		12	All	640
		14	All	640
		16	All	640
		18	All	640

L3.3

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
32 N.	34-1/2 E	1	All	120
		12	All	120
33 N.	34-1/2 E	24	All	120
		25	All	120
		36	All	120
32 N.	33 E.	1	All	640
33 N.	33 E.	24	All	640
		25	N 1/2	320
			SE 1/4	160
30 N.	35 E.	7	E 1/4	160
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		11	N 1/2	320
		18	All	640
		30	W 1/4	160
30 N.	33 E.	4	All	640
		6	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		8	All	640
		16	NE 1/4	160
		18	W 1/2	320
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		30	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
29 N.	33 E.	6	W 1/4	160
		28	S 1/2	320
			W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
28 N.	33 E.	6	S 1/2	320
28 N.	32 E.	2	NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		10	SE 1/4	160
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
		12	NW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			S 1/2	320

L 3.3

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
		14	All	640
		16	NW 1/4	160
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		20	N 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		22	S 1/2	320
			S 1/2 N 1/2	160
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		34	All	640
27 N.	32 E.	4	All	480
26 N.	32 E.	8	E 1/2	320
		16	All	640
		20	E 1/2	320
		30	SE 1/4	160
		32	All	640
25 N.	32 E.	6	All	480
25 N.	31 E.	28	All	600
26 N.	31 E.	6	W 1/2	320
			SW 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			W 1/2 SE 1/4	80
		8	W 1/2 NW 1/4	80
		36	SE 1/4	160
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
27 N.	31 E.	4	W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		30	E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			S 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
28 N.	31 E.	26	NW 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			W 1/2 SE 1/4	80
30 N.	35 E.	12	NE 1/4	160
		13	All	640
30 N.	23 E.	19	All	640
		30	All	640
		31	All	640
		18	All	640

L3.3

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
30 N.	22 E.	12	All	640
		13	E 1/4	160
			W 1/4	160
		24	E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4	160
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		25	W 1/2	320
		36	All	640
34 N.	23 E.	23	NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		24	E 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		25	E 1/4	160
		1	NW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
		12	SE 1/4	160
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			S 1/2 NE 1/4	80
35 N.	23 E.	11	E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4	160
		14	All	640
		23	W 1/4	160
			E 1/2 SW 1/4	80
		36	SW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
36 N.	23 E.	36	E 1/2	320
			SW 1/4	160
			E 1/2 NW 1/4	80
26 N.	38 E.	25	All	640
		26	All	640
		32	N 1/2	320
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
			N 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	40
		33	All	640
		34	All	640
		36	All	640
25 N.	38 E.	1	All	640
		2	All	640
		3	All	640
		5	All	640

# L 3.3

<u>Township</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Acres</u>
		8	All	640
		9	All	640
		10	All	640
		12	All	640
26 N.	39 E.	19	All	640
		29	N 1/2	320
			E 1/2 SE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4 SE 1/4	40
			W 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			NE 1/4 SW 1/4	40
		30	E 1/2	320
		31	W 1/2	320
			W 1/2 E 1/2	
			SE 1/4 SE 1/4	
			NE 1/4 NE 1/4	
		32	SW 1/4 NE 1/4	40
			SE 1/4	160
			E 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			SE 1/4 NW 1/4	40
			SW 1/4	160
25 N.	39 E.	5	All	640
		7	All	640
		8	E 1/4	160
			W 1/2 NE 1/4	80
			NW 1/4	160
			N 1/2 SW 1/4	80
			SW 1/4 SW 1/4	40
				<hr/> 61,720

These lands are rated as AG-1 through AG- on the L1-S-1, L1-BW-1 and L1-BH-1 Overlays.

## Multiple Use Analysis

### Complement

Range Management 3.1 - through land disposal or exchange transfer the title of the public lands shown on Table RM 3.1 to private individuals.

L 3.3 (continued)

Geothermal 5.2 - offer the following KGRAs for competitive leasing as soon as possible.

1. Soldier Meadows
2. Double Hot springs
3. Trego
4. Gerlach
5. Gerlach Northeast
6. Fly Ranch
7. Fly Ranch Northeast
8. San Emidio Desert
9. Brady Hazen

Portions of the identified lands are within the <sup>f</sup>ly Ranch KGRA.

Geothermal 5.3 - make the following public lands available for geothermal leasing.

Included in the (M 5.3) list are the following lands that also occur on this Lands 1.7 recommendation:

- T. 25 N., R. 31 E., Secs. 12, 14, 22
- T. 28 N., R. 32 E., Sec. 10

Range 1.1 - allocate all available forage to livestock.

Wild Horses and burros 1.1 - designate the Fox and Lake Range as a horse management area. This conflicts with land 3.3 in the San Emidio area.

Watershed 3.4 - prohibit land disposals, any land treatment or disturbance activities which would likely result in or significant reduction (by 50% or more) the amount of vegetative cover in areas designated as having (a) "high" erosion susceptibility of (b) "high" vegetal-soil factor.

Watershed 3.5 - retain public lands which lie within 100-year floodplains in public ownership. Minimize development within the 100-year floodplain boundary.

Wildlife 1.8 - improve the riparian habitat condition throughout the planning area, and once improved, maintain riparian habitat in good or excellent condition.

Some of the lands recommended for disposal/lease are riparian areas adjacent to the Humboldt River.



L 3.3 (continued)

Overlapping disposal recommendations with the following lands:

- T. 34 N., R. 38 E., Sec. 6, portions west of county road  
Sec. 20
- T. 34 N., R. 36 E., Sec. 6, All  
Sec. 24, E1/2  
Sec. 12, W1/2
- T. 34 N., R. 35 E., Sec. 10, All public  
Sec. 14, W1/2  
Sec. 22, All public  
Sec. 34, All public
- T. 32 N., R. 34 E., Sec. 5, All public portions
- T. 32 N., R. 33 E., Sec. 1, All public portions

Wild Horse and burros 1.3 - remove all wild horses/burros from the following checkerboard HUAs (see Sonoma-Gerlach WH/B MFP 1 Overlay) in a three-year time period.

The majority of the lands identified in this recommendation (L 3.3) are within the checkerboard area.

Conflict

Minerals 1.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the development of "Strategic and Critical Materials" which occur on public lands or other federally owned minerals within the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area.

Minerals 1.2 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the potential development of economically important minerals occurring on public lands or other federally owned minerals within mining districts or other areas outside of designated mining districts.

Minerals 6.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with the leasing and development of lands classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as being prospectively valuable for sodium and potassium.

Conflict in the Hualapai and San Emidio Area.

Geothermal 5.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with or prevent geothermal leasing, exploration, and/or development on public lands, or any other lands containing federally owned minerals, classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as Prospectively Valuable for Geothermal Resources, or land classified as Known Geothermal Resource Areas (KGRA).

L 3.3 (continued)

Wildlife 1.26 - improve waterfowl habitat in the following areas:

- Carson Sink
- Humboldt Sink
- Rye Patch and Pit Taylor Reservoirs
- Brook Spring
- High Rock Lake
- Dry Lake
- Reservoirs along Mud Meadow Creek
- Other areas as identified.

Portions of the Rye Patch and Pit Taylor areas have been identified for agricultural disposal/lease.

Wildlife Aquatic 1.1 - mark streams and other water sources for special management attention. Designate the resource areas fishing streams as ACECs and all riparian areas in association with major streams.

Recreation 2.1 - retain public lands in identified recreation areas of Class A and B quality with the exception of those lands immediately adjacent to Rye Patch Reservoir.

Recreation 2.2 - retain those lands that provide access to the Humboldt River and those lands that adjoin the river but have no vehicular access.

Recreation 3.1 - allow no action to degrade the visual resources listed in Class I, II, III, and IV.

Majority of the lands identified for agricultural disposal/lease are in Class II, III, and IV.

Cultural 1.7 - designate the following areas as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern:

1. All sites rated S1 or S2.
2. All high probability areas identified on URA Overlay 1 for each of the three planning units
3. The Applegate-Lassen Trail and environs as defined in Recommendation 1.2.

This recommendation L 3.3 contains many areas identified as #1 or #2 above.

The PAA (page 164) states that the release of public lands for agricultural development is considered a major issue by the general public in the resource area.

Many of the lands identified are on the fringes of blocked public land areas. Disposal under the agricultural laws, DLE and Carey Act, would help to eliminate some isolated public lands which now are difficult to administer.

## L 3.3

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION:

Make lands available for agricultural disposal provided:

1. Disposal is in the national interest.
2. Soils are determined to be suitable.
3. Water is available.
4. The disposal is compatible with local government plans and is coordinated with local government entities to insure that necessary services and appurtenances such as roads, schools, etc., are possible and practical.

First priority will be given to those lands which will result in expansion of existing agricultural units or areas.

Rationale

Agricultural disposal is consistent with Bureau policy and mandated by the Desert Land Entry Act and the Carey Act. Agricultural use should be by disposal under these acts rather than by long term leases.

Those lands adjacent to or touching portions of the Humboldt River should be retained to provide the public access the river, and to provide riparian habitat along this river.

The idea is to make legitimate agricultural land available. What we are trying to prevent are nuisance applications which are not legitimate and which would result in an appreciable increase in agricultural land.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

L-4

Objective: L-4

To provide lands for rights-of-ways on or across public lands.

Rationale:

The federal government is the largest landholder in the Resource Area. Maximum utilization, use, and sustained yield of these lands require access roads. Communities and isolated ranches also require electrical power lines. The regional economy is dependent on power transmission lines, gas pipelines, communications sites, railroads, and interstate highways. With the land ownership patterns of large federal land and intermingled private and federal lands, it is nearly impossible for any utility line or road to avoid federal lands. Utilization of federal lands for this public use is authorized in FLPMA Section 501(a).

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Activity

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 4.1

MFP I

Designate right-of-way corridors along existing transportation and utility facilities with an unspecified width but limited to the minimum spacing between new and existing permitted by technology when considering the total picture of access, soils, economics, geology, ecology, reliability, etc.

Rationale:

Rights-of-ways in common will minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-ways. Additional facilities in the immediate vicinity of existing rights-of-ways will not add significantly to the visual quality impact, will facilitate management of the uses, and can use existing access roads.

These utility routes were established over the years taking into account engineering, economics, and the terrain to be traversed between points. These same criteria should still be valid for future utilities, unless some new and compelling values in the national interest should justify deviation from these corridors.

Corridors will minimize the BLM workload, because once an EAR is prepared it can only be updated for subsequent actions in the corridor. Also, utility companies will then know where they can route lines with the least environmental disturbance that will be acceptable to BLM.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

L 4.1 (continued)

Specifically this recommendation conflicts with the designated corridors in the area north of the Western Pacific Railroad.

Cultural 1.6 - preserve the following sites by prohibiting all forms of surface disturbance, including ORV use and mining:

CrNV-02-842	Parran Site	5 acres
CrNV-02-1889	Upsal Site	160 acres*
CrNV-02-2233	Sadmat Site	10 acres*
CrNV-02-1930	Peter Ting Sr. Site	20 acres
CrNV-02-584	Summit Twin Springs Blinds	25 acres

\*only partially on public lands

Specifically potential conflicts in corridor designation could conflict with the Upsal, Sadmat and Peter Ting Sr. Site.

L 4.1 (continued)

The designated corridors are in close proximity of most KGRAs. This fact should encourage or benefit geothermal production.

Conflict

Wildlife 1.22 - all special use permits for powerline rights-of-ways granted in the future within raptor areas in the resource area will contain stipulations requiring that powerline support structures be designed to minimize the possibility of bird electrocution due to contacting two or more wires simultaneously, or a hot wire and ground simultaneously. In addition, such right-of-ways will not be permitted within 400 yards of roads, unless absolutely necessary. This will minimize shooting of raptors perching on power poles.

Where possible, this recommendation also applies for existing right-of-ways when power companies apply for permits to modify existing lines.

Wildlife 1.23 - protect from unnecessary disturbance or destruction all raptor nest sites that are presently active or which are known to have been active in the last five years.

Cultural 1.2 - under a Cultural Resource Management Plan preserve integrity of setting of the entire Buffalo Hills Planning Unit portion of the Applegate-Lassen Emigrant Trail. Until such a plan has been approved, avoid creating visual intrusions as seen from the trail in the following areas:

- T. 35 N., R. 25 E., north of the Western Pacific Railroad
- T. 34 N., R. 24 E., east of the crest of hills on western margin in playa
- T. 34 N., R. 25 E., north of the Western Pacific Railroad
- T. 34 N., R. 26 E., north of the Western Pacific Railroad
- T. 34 N., R. 27 E., north of the Western Pacific Railroad
- T. 35 N., R. 24 E., east of the crest of the Calico Mountains
- T. 35 N., R. 25 E.; T. 35 N., R. 26 E.; T. 35 N., R. 27 E.; north of the Western Pacific Railroad
- T. 35-1/2 N., R. 25 E.; T. 35-1/2 N., R. 26 E.; T. 35-1/2 N., R. 27 E.; T. 36 N., R. 24 E.; east of the crest of the Calico Mountains.
- T. 26 N., R. 25 E.; T. 36 N., R. 26 E.; west of the crest of the Black Rock Range
- T. 37 N., R. 24 E., east of the crest of the Calico Mountains
- T. 37 N., R. 25 E.; T. 37 N., R. 26 E.; west of the crest of the Black Rock Range.
- T. 38 N., R. 24 E., east of the crest of the Calico Mountains
- T. 38 N., R. 25 E.; T. 38 N., R. 26 E.; west of the crest of the Black Rock Range
- T. 39 N., R. 24 E.; T. 39 N., R. 25 E.; T. 39 N., R. 26 E.; west of the crest of the Black Rock Range
- T. 40 N., R. 24 E.; T. 40 N., R. 25 E.

Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III  
Lands 4.1

As Currently Written:

Designate right-of-way corridors along existing transportation and utility facilities with a specified width of 1.5 miles on each side of the existing transportation/utility facility as shown on lands overlay MFP Overlay f2. Exceptions to this width requirement will be made on a case by case basis following a multiple use analysis of a specific proposal.

In addition, no transportation or utility corridor will be approved on the Black Rock Playa north of the Western Pacific Railroad tracks, or in those areas identified in cultural resource recommendations 1.2 and 1.6.

The separation of rights-of-way within the designated corridors will be limited to the minimum spacing required by technology, topography, reliability, visual impacts, etc.

All powerline rights-of-way well within raptor areas will contain stipulations requiring anti-bird electrocution structures, and wherever feasible and possible such rights-of-way will not be constructed within 400 yards of existing roads to minimize shooting of raptors.

Change To:

Designate right-of-way corridors along existing transportation and utility facilities with a specified width of 1.5 miles on each side of the existing transportation/utility facility. Exceptions to this width requirement will be made on a case by case basis following a multiple use analysis of a specific proposal.

In the vicinity of the Black Rock Desert Playa from Sulphur to Gerlach, transportation or utility facilities will be located within a designated corridor bounded one-quarter mile north and two and three-quarter miles south of the Western Pacific Railroad. Only underground utility facilities will be located north of the Western Pacific Railroad.

The separation of rights-of-way within the designated corridors will be limited to the minimum spacing required by technology, topography, reliability, visual impacts, etc.

All new powerline rights-of-way grants within raptor areas will contain raptor protection stipulations as means of mitigation.

Future rights-of-way corridors will be evaluated on a case by case basis, but should be as consistent as possible with the western states corridor study. No utility facilities will be allowed to cross the playa of the Black Rock Desert, other than the corridor previously mentioned.



Rationale:

Rights-of-way in common will minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way. Additional facilities in the immediate vicinity of existing rights-of-way will not add significantly to the visual quality impact, will facilitate management of the uses, and can use existing access roads.

These utility routes were established over the years taking into account engineering, economics, and the terrain to be traversed between points. These same criteria should still be valid for future utilities, unless some new and compelling values in the national interest should justify deviation from these corridors.

Corridors will minimize the BLM workload, because once an EAR is prepared it can be updated for subsequent actions in the corridor. Also, utility companies will then know where they can route lines with the least environmental disturbance that will be acceptable to BLM.

The definitions of designated right-of-way corridor and transportation and utility corridor are found in Final Rulemaking Rights-of-way, Principles and Procedures; Amendment of Right-of-way Regulations (47 F.R. 38804 et seq. September 2, 1982).

Persons-Organizations That Have Protested This Decision:

Sierra Pacific Power Company, Reno, Nevada. See letter enclosed.

Other Comments Were Received From:

Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, Reno, Nevada.  
Nevada Division of Mineral Resources, Carson City, Nevada.

MFP II

L 4.1

### Multiple Use Recommendations

Designate right-of-way corridors along existing transportation and utility facilities with a specified width of 1.5 miles on each side of the existing transportation/utility facility as shown on lands overlay MFP Overlay #2. Exceptions to this width requirement will be made on a case by case basis following a multiple use analysis of a specific proposals.

In addition, no transportation or utility corridor will be approved on the Black Rock Playa north of the Western Pacific Railroad tracks, or in those areas identified in cultural resource recommendation 1.2 and 1.6.

The separation of right-of-ways within the designated corridors will be limited to the minimum spacing required by technology, topography, reliability, visual impacts, etc.

All powerline rights-of-way well within raptor areas will contain stipulations requiring anti-bird electrocution structures, and wherever feasible and possible such rights-of-way will not be constructed within 400 yards of existing roads to minimize shooting of raptors.

### Rationale

By establishing and using utility corridors, environmental impacts should be reduced, right-of-way applications should be expedited by reducing case file actions and analysis, and maintenance costs of facilities should be reduced.

MFP III

### DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

### Multiple Use Analysis

All resource activities have identified conflicts with this recommendation.

Most resource conflicts are minor, however, and the idea of confining utility facilities into designated corridors would in fact minimize the environmental distrubant to all resource activities when compared to a non-designated random construction of utilities right-of-ways across the planning area.

Specific utility or corridor recommendation follows.

### Complement

Geothermal 5.1 - make no land-use decisions that would interfere with or prevent geothermal leasing, exploration, and/or development on public lands, or any other lands containing federally owned minerals, classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as Prospectively Valuable for Geothermal Resources, or land classified as Known Geothermal Resource Areas (KGRA).

Agreement w/  
PPCo. - we would  
allow a buried  
powerline N. of  
tracks.  
SAT 2-24-84

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)	
Sonoma-Gerlach	
Activity	
Lands 4.2	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendation: L 4.2

Reserve all mountain tops and ridges for communications sites.

Rationale:

Most of the mountain tops and ridges in the Resource Area are in public ownership. These are the prime communications sites. With ownership of these prime sites, the BLM has some control over any facilities contemplated thereon and therefore some control over the proliferation of service utilities across other public lands. BLM can also insure that the maximum multiple use and sustained yield is achieved on each site instead of spreading these uses over various sites.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

Multiple Use Recommendation

Provide for communication sites on public land by using existing sites when frequencies are compatible.

Develop new communication sites only when environmental or technical problems on an existing site are incompatible with new applications.

New sites will be in compliance with Interim Management Policy and Guidelines in all WSAs.

New site development and road construction will be permitted only when no feasible alternative can be used on the following mountain ranges:

- Fox Range
- Buffalo Hills
- Granite Range
- Calico Range
- Black Rock Range
- Selenite Range
- Sonoma Range
- Tobin Range
- East Range
- Stillwater Range
- Humboldt Range
- West Humboldt Range

And further that no new communication sites disrupt the integrity of setting of the Buffalo Hills portion of the Applegate-Lassen Emigrant Trail.

Rationale

Existing communication sites have developed access and by sharing the site cheaper maintenance and less environmental disturbance is possible.

New sites will be needed but this authorized use must be compatible to the maximum extent with other ongoing Bureau programs and procedures.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

Multiple Use Analysis

This recommendation conflicts with most activities but in most cases these conflicts are minor. Exceptions to minor conflicts are listed below.

Conflict

Wilderness 1.2 - all activities within Intensive and Wilderness Study Areas under wilderness review will be in accordance with the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines.

L 4.2 (continued)

This involves specific potential communication sites in WSA #104, 012, 019, 200, and 201.

Wildlife 1.24 - limit off-road vehicle use during the lambing season (February 1 to May 31) in bighorn sheep use areas as reintroductions are made, and in other crucial wildlife habitats as they are identified.

Wildlife 1.25 - limit new trail or road construction on potential bighorn sheep range to minimize access. Potential bighorn sheep ranges include the following:

- Fox Range
- Buffalo Hills
- Granite Range
- Calico Range
- Black Rock Range
- Selenite Range
- Sonoma Range
- Tobin Range
- East Range
- Stillwater Range
- Humboldt Range
- West Humboldt Range

Cultural 1.2 - preserve the integrity of setting of the entire Buffalo Hills Planning Unit portion of the Applegate-Lassen Emigrant Trail. Avoid creating visual intrusions as seen from the trail in the following areas:

- Crest of the Black Rock Range

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands

Objective Number

L-5

Objective: L-5

Insure legal access to all public lands.

Rationale:

Other specialists in this planning process have identified various legal access needs. Lack of legal access impairs public uses and management of the public lands.

Of approximately 578 miles of access roads used by BLM, approximately 186 miles are over private lands without benefit of easement. This will necessitate approximately 115 easements. Until these are acquired, they have the potential of being closed to both administrative and public use.

The Nevada Department of Wildlife has identified public lands in the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area where access is already impaired. Some of these private owners are leasing the same public land that they are denying public access to. Other areas of the state have been identified where the public is charged a fee for access to public lands. One area exists where private lands exclude public access to public lands unless the lessee, a Master Guide, is employed who then uses the public lands as though they were his private preserve for commercial hunting expeditions.

Conditions conducive to this same type of restricted access are existing in the Sonoma-Gerlach Resource Area. Various actions such as new owners or public disrespect for private property could precipitate increased restrictive access to the public lands unless legal access is insured.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN  
RECOMMENDATION-ANALYSIS-DECISION

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity

Lands 5.1

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Recommendation: L 5.1

Review all proposed disposals of public lands and retain any needed legal access to the remaining public lands.

Rationale:

Legal access is vital to public use and administration of public lands. We should not compound potential problems by disposals of access.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
4/80

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1000-21 (April 1975)

L 5.1

Multiple Use Recommendations

MFP II

Review all proposed disposals of public lands and retain any needed legal access to the remaining public lands.

Rationale

Legal access to public lands by the public and by the Bureau is vital to the use and administration of the public lands. Future disposals should not compound the problems of access to the public lands.

Multiple Use Analysis

Complement

Fire 1.1 - improve legal access into fire prevention problem areas and fire problem Class IV and V areas as defined in the Nevada Normal Fire Year Plan. The lands adjacent to the railroads and I-80 from the Humboldt County Line northwest to Golconda and from Winnemucca southwest to Rye Patch are within fire prevention problem areas. Buffalo Valley southwest of I-80 is a designated Class V fire problem area. A land area bounded by Winnemucca on the north, the Sonoma Range on the east, the Humboldt River on the west, and the Pershing County Line on the south is a designated fire problem Class IV areas. A second Class IV area is located in the Rye Patch - Mill City - Rye Patch Reservoir area. Legal access into ACECs should also be improved as needed.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

FIRE



## MFP III 45.2

Provide legal access to the following areas:

1. Stillwater firewood areas
2. Granite Mountain
3. Rodeo Creek
4. Buffalo Hills
5. Golconda Canyon
6. Clear Creek
7. Sonoma Creek
8. Spaulding Canyon
9. Negro Creek
10. Mahogany Creek

### Rationale:

The above areas were identified in the planning process as being high priority need for legal access.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN - STEP 1  
ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Name (MFP)

Sonoma-Gerlach

Activity  
Lands

Objective Number

L-6

Objective: L-6

Legalize or eliminate all unauthorized uses of the public lands and collect compensation for any loss or damage suffered by the United States as the result of such uses.

Rationale:

Unauthorized use restricts or denies other authorized uses and does not provide a fair market value for use of the public lands and their resources as required in FLPMA Sect. 102(a)(9) and is unlawful (43 CFR 9230).

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80

L 6.1

MFP III Existing Unauthorized Use:

Pursue the following existing unauthorized use cases and either authorize or abate them. Coordinate with state and local government officials.

Porter Springs  
Adobe Flat Occupancy  
Lichfield Occupancy

Future Unauthorized Use:

Utilize this land use plan to determine the disposition of each trespass as per the policy statement for unauthorized use approve by the Secretary of the Interior on December 24, 1980.

MFP I

Recommendation: L 6.1

Check boundaries of all expanding subdivisions and of isolated dwellings for encroachment and take action as necessary.

Rationale:

One subdivision survey is known to be in error and lot sales containing portions of public land have already been recorded. All communities within the Resource Area are experiencing some expansion, with the possibility of trespass increasing.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject the recommendation.

Reasons

MFP decision is not required to initiate trespass action.

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

Make a part of the District's standard operating procedures.

MFP II

MFP III

**MFP I**

Recommendation: L 6.2

Check all utility lines on public lands for authorized use.

Rationale:

Some uses are suspected of not being authorized at all and some uses have increased beyond the original permitted use. Multiple use of utility poles is desirable and common practice by the industry; however, each use must also be permitted by BLM.

Multiple Use Recommendation

Reject the recommendation.

Reasons

MFP decision is not required to initiate trespass action.

**MFP II**

**FP III**

DISTRICT MANAGER'S DECISION

Accept the Area Manager's recommendation and rationale.

Nevada  
Winnemucca  
Barlow  
2/80